White-Hall, March 18. 1690.

Let this be Printed.

SYDNEY.

White-Hall, March 18. 1690.

Let this be Printed.

SYDNEY.

AN

ANSVVER

To the

PAPER

Delivered by

Mr *ASHTON* at his Execution

TO

Sir Francis Child:

SHERIFF of *London*, &c.

Together with

The Paper it self.

LONDON:

Printed for *Robert Clavell*, at the *Peacock* in S. *Paul's* Church-Yard. 1690.

HARVARD COLLEGE LIBRARY
TREAT FUND
Feb. 10, 1931

Mr. *Aſhton's* Paper.

Mr. Sheriffe,

HAVING obſerved that the Methods of making Speeches at the place of Execution was not alwayes attended with the deſigned Succeſs; And thinking it better to imploy my laſt Minutes in Devotion and Holy Communion with my God; I have prepared this Paper to leave in your Hands, as well to aſſert my Principles as to teſtifie my Innocency. As to my Religion I profeſſe, by God's Grace, I dye in the Faith into which I was baptized, that of the Church of England, *in whoſe Communion (nothing doubting of my Salvation thro the Merits of my Saviour) I have alwayes thought my ſelfe ſafe and happy; according to her Principles and late much eſteemed Doctrines (tho now unhappily exploded) I have regulated my Life, beleiving my ſelfe obliged by my Religion to looke upon my rightfull lawfull Prince (whatever his Principles were or his Practiſes might be) as God's Vicegerent, and accountable (if guilty of Male-adminiſtration) to God only, from whom he received his Power, and alwayes beleiving it to be contrary to the Laws of God, the Church, and the Realme, upon any pretence whatſoever to take up Arms againſt him, and let all the World take notice, in this Beleife I dye. But I have more particu-*

lar

lar Obligation to the King my Maſter, whom I have had the honour to ſerve, and received many ſignal Favours from him, for ſixteen years paſt, ſo that Gratitude (a thing not much eſteemed at this time) as well as Duty and Religion Commanded the utmoſt Service I could pay him; and when I add theſe Conſiderations that we were born his Liege Subjects, that we have ſolemnly profeſſed our Allegiance, and often confirmed it with Oaths, That his Majeſties Uſage after the Prince of Orange's *arrival was very hard, ſevere, (and if I may ſo ſay) Unjuſt; And that all the new Methods of ſettling this Nation have hitherto made it more miſerable Poor, and more expoſed to Foreign Enemies. And the Religion we pretend to be ſo fond of preſerving, now much more than ever likely to be deſtroyed: There ſeems to me no way to prevent the Impending evils, and ſave theſe Nations from poverty and deſtruction, but the Calling home our Injured Sovereign, who as a true Father of his Country has (notwithſtanding all his Provocations and Injuries) a natural love and tenderneſs for all his Subjects, and I am ſo far from repining at the loſs of my life, that had I ten thouſand I ſhould think my ſelf obliged to ſacrifice them all rather than omit any juſt and honeſt means to promote ſo good and neceſſary a work; and I adviſe and deſire all my fellow Subjects to think of their Duty and return to their Allegiance, before the ſevere Judgment of God overtake them, for their Perjury and Rebellion, but certainly the good and Intereſt of theſe Nations, abſtracted from all other Conſiderations, will ere long convince them of the neceſſity of doing it.*

Having thus frankly declared my Principles, I know the Inference will be, that I have acted accordingly and conſequently that am I now juſtly condemned; but as I ingenuouſly own the Premiſſes, ſo as I poſitively deny the Conſequence; for whatever my Inclinations or Actions have been, yet, as to the Matter I was ſentenced to dye for, I declare my ſelf innocent, and will ap-

peal

peal even to the Judges themſelves, whether or no, upon my Tryal, there appeared the leaſt proof that I knew a tittle contained in the Papers, but Preſumption was, with the Jury, thought ſufficient to find me guilty, tho I am told, I am the firſt Man that ever was condemned for High Treaſon upon bare Suſpicion or Preſumption, and that contrary to my L. Coke's and other eminent Lawyers Opinions. The knowledg of my own Innocency, as to the Indictment and Charge againſt me, was that that armed me with ſo much aſſurance, and occaſioned my caſting my Life upon the firſt Twelve Men of the Pannel, without challenging any. But tho I have, I think, juſt reaſon to complain of the ſevere Charge given by the Judges, and hard meaſure I have received, not to mention my cloſe Impriſonment, the haſty and violent Proceedings againſt me, nor the Induſtry uſed in the Return of fitting Perſons to paſs upon me, the denying me a Copy of the Pannel, &c. Yet, as I hope for Pardon and Forgiveneſs at the hands of my God, ſo do I moſt heartily pray for, and forgive them, and all my Enemies, all the World, nay even that Judg and Jury-Man who did ſo ſignally (contrary to common Juſtice) expoſe themſelves to deſtroy me. But let the Will of God be done: I rely wholly upon his Mercy and the Merits of my bleſſed Saviour for Salvation, I do chearfully and entirely reſign my ſelf into his Hands, as into the Hands of a faithful Creator, in ſure and certain hopes of a happy Reſurrection: Bleſs, protect, and ſtrengthen, O Lord God, my good and gracious King and Maſter; in thy due time let the Virtue, Goodneſs, and Innocency of the Queen, my Miſtreſs, make all her Enemies bluſh, and ſilence the wicked and unjuſt Calumnies that Malice and Envy have raiſed againſt her; make her and theſe Nations happy in the Prince of Wales, whom from unanſwerable and undoubted Proofs I know to be her Son; reſtore them all when thou ſeeſt fit to their juſt Rights, and on ſuch a bottom as may ſupport and eſtabliſh the Church of England,

and

and once more make her flouriſhe, notwithſtanding the Wounds ſhe hath received of late from her prevaricating Sons.

Forgive, forgive, O Lord, all my Enemyes, bleſs all my Friends, comfort and ſupport my deare afflicted Wife, and poor Babes, be thou a Husband and a Father to them; for their ſakes only I could have wiſhed to live; but pardon that Wiſhe, O good God, and take my Soule into thy everlaſting Glory. Amen.

JN° ASHTON.

The ANSWER.

THE Paper which paſſeth under the Name of Mr. *Aſhton*'s SPEECH ſeems to me to be compoſed with too much Art and Care to be the Work of one who profeſſeth, he *thought it better to employ his laſt minutes in Devotion*: And if he was *ſo illiterate and unskilled in the Law*, as he ſaid at his Tryal, *Fol.* 111. one may juſtly wonder not only at ſuch Terms as *Impending*, *Prevaricating*, *Premiſſes*, and *Conſequence*, &c. but at ſuch a peremptory Judgment as he gives *about the Laws of the Realm*, in a Caſe that muſt be acknowledged by all ingenuous men of his own Party to have a great deal of Difficulty in it.

But there are ſome Men who think to bear down all others by their Confidence, and would have it taken for granted that the whole Nation (themſelves excepted) is under the guilt of *Perjury* and *Rebellion*.

Theſe are the modeſt Terms in this Speech, which at leaſt do not become the Charity of one juſt going out of the World.

Therefore

Therefore I rather believe it to be drawn up by ſome Perſons of more Art and Leiſure; who thought it beſt to convey their own *Sentiments* (as they call them) under the more popular Name of one who ſuffered for their Cauſe.

But the Weight of what is ſaid doth not depend on the Perſon, and therefore I ſhall calmly and impartially conſider the Things themſelves and ſhew how unjuſt and unreaſonable the Inſinuations are which reſpect the preſent Government, and all ſuch who act in Obedience to it.

There are two Things this Paper is ſaid to be deſign'd for, *to aſſert his Principles* and *to teſtify his Innocency*. For his *Principles* he *profeſſeth, that he dyes in the Faith and Communion of the* Church of England. And he might have lived longer in both if he had pleaſed; for I cannot ſee how the *Faith and Communion of the* Church of *England* obliged him to do that for which he ſuffered: But, by the *Faith of the* Church of *England* he means the *Doctrine of Paſſive Obedience*. Be it ſo: however he ſuffered not for his *Paſſive Obedience*, but for the want of it: If he *had regulated his Life by this Principle*, he had preſerved it; yet he ſaith he did ſo, and dyed for it. There muſt be certainly then ſome great Miſtake about the *Doctrines and Principles of our Church*. I alwayes thought thoſe are to be found in the *Articles* and *Conſtitutions* of it. Which of theſe did he ſuffer for?

They are, he ſaith, *her Principles and late much eſteemed Doctrines tho now unhappily exploded*. I know of no *Doctrines* or *Principles of the* Church of *England* which are *exploded* among us; and therefore this is *unhappily* inſiſted on by a dying Man, unleſs he had given ſome Proof of it.

Well; but he believed himſelf obliged by his Religion to look upon his Rightful, Lawful Prince (whatever *his Principles were or his Practices might be*) *as God's Vicegerent, and accountable to God only, from whom he received his Power*. All this he might have done, and have been alive ſtill; for the Matter in diſpute is not whether *Rightful, Lawful Kings are to be obeyed*, but who in our preſent Circumſtances is our

Rightful, Lawful Sovereign; not whether *Kings be not God's Vicegerents*, but whether God doth not ſometimes confer the Right of Sovereignty by a *Law ſuperiour* to the *Laws* of *particular Countries*, that is, by the *Law of Nations*, which eſtabliſheth ſuch a *Right* upon the ſucceſs of a juſt War; not *whether Sovereign Princes are not accountable only to God*, but whether Allegiance be not due where the Rights of Sovereignty are placed, by an *extraordinary Act of Providence* and the *concurrent Conſent of the Nation*. But he goes on; *And alwayes believing it to be contrary to the Laws of God, the Church, and the Realm, upon any Pretence whatſoever to take up Arms againſt him, and let all the World take notice in this Belief I dye.* I had much rather have *taken notice* that in this Belief he lived; for I ſee no Reaſon of his dying for it. For, why muſt a Man be ſaid to die for *not taking up Arms*, who was Condemned to die for a Deſign juſt contrary, *viz.* for the ſubverting the preſent Government by Domeſtick Inſurrections and Foreign Power?

So that the Queſtion is not about *Paſſive Obedience* but to whom it is due; I grant that the *Laws of God and of the Realm* are to determine the Meaſures of our Obedience; but here lies the only Point, whether the Rights of Sovereignty may not be tranſferred by the ſucceſs of a juſt War and the Conſent of the People: For if they may, then according to his own Principles he ſuffered *juſtly*. And if the Directors of his Conſcience did not ſpeak to this Point, they led him into a dangerous Error, and have been too much the Occaſion of his ſuffering.

Therefore to clear this whole Matter, and to prevent the like Miſtakes in others; I ſhall endeavour to ſtate the preſent Caſe of our Government, ſo as to ſhew both that it is our Duty to ſubmit to it, and that no *Principles or Doctrins of the* Church of *England* are violated thereby.

To do this, we muſt of neceſſity look back to the Occaſions of this great Revolution: And there were two principal Occaſions of it. First,

Firſt, Great and violent Preſumptions of an Injury to the Right of Succeſſion.

Secondly, Too great Evidence of a formed Deſign to ſubvert the eſtabliſhed Religion and Civil Liberties of the Nation.

Now there are two very material Queſtions which ariſe from hence.

Firſt, Whether theſe were the *juſt Occaſions* of a War?

Secondly, Whether upon the ſucceſs of this War the *Rights of Sovereignty* were duly transferred?

If theſe were *juſt Occaſions* of a War, and upon the Succeſs thereof the *Sovereignty* was duly transferred, then there can be no Diſpute left to whom our Allegiance is due.

It is taken for granted by all who underſtand theſe Matters, that as there is a *Law of Nature*, which determines the Rights and Properties of particular Nations; and that all private Perſons are bound to ſubmit to the municipal Laws of thoſe Societies for their Peace and Security: So there are other Laws which concern thoſe *Nations*, as they make up ſeveral *independent Governments* upon each other. And there are ſeveral Rights which belong to them with reſpect to one another, which do not belong to private Perſons as they live in ſubjection to any particular Government.

And as there are ſuch Rights, ſo there muſt be a juſt and lawful way for Reparation of Injuries. In particular Governments, the thing is plain by eſtabliſhed Laws and Courts of Judicature, whoſe Sentence is Executed by the Civil Power; but in Separate Nations and Independent Governments, although there be Laws by conſent called the *Law of Nations*; yet there is no common Judicature to determine of Right and Wrong, and therefore in caſe of Injury there is an allowance for the injured Party by this *Law of Nations* to Right himſelf by Force, as there would be to every particular Perſon, if there were no Laws nor Power to ſee them executed.

There is then a Right in every Sovereign and Independent Prince to exerciſe Force againſt another Prince, who detains any Right from him, or doth any Injury to him, or to thoſe he is bound to defend.

The Queſtion then comes to the *Juſt Occaſions* of ſuch a War, and here are two aſſigned,

Firſt, great and violent Preſumptions of an Injury to the Right of Succeſſion. This is expreſly mentioned and inſiſted on, in the Declaration of the then Prince of *Orange* (our preſent King) in theſe Words ——— "But to crown all, there "are great and violent Preſumptions inducing us to believe "that thoſe evil Counſellors, in order to the carrying on "of their ill deſigns, and to the gaining to themſelves the "more time, for the effecting of them, for the encouraging "their Complices, and for the diſcouraging of all good Sub- "jects, hath publiſhed that the Queen hath brought forth "a Son; tho there have appeared both during the Queen's "pretended Bigneſs and in the manner in which the Birth "was managed, ſo many juſt and viſible grounds of Suſpi- "cion, that not only we our ſelves, but all the good Subjects "of theſe Kingdoms do vehemently ſuſpect that the pre- "tended Prince of *Wales* was not born of the Queen: And "it is notoriouſly known to all the World, that many both "doubted of the Queens Bigneſs, and of the Birth of the "Child, and yet there was not any one thing done to ſa- "tisfie them and to put an end to all Doubts. And ſince "our Deareſt and moſt entirely beloved Conſort, the Prin- "ceſs, and likewiſe we our ſelves have ſo great an Intereſt "in this matter, and ſuch a Right as all the World knows "to the Succeſſion to the Crown —— And ſince the *En- "gliſh* Nation hath ever teſtified a moſt particular Affecti- "on and Eſteem both to our Deareſt Conſort and to our "Selves; We cannot excuſe our Selves from eſpouſing their "Intereſts in a matter of ſuch high Conſequence, and from "contributing all that lies in us, for maintaining both of the

"Proteſtant

"Proteſtant Religion, and of the Laws and Liberties of "thoſe Kingdoms, and for the ſecuring to them the conti- "nual Enjoyment of all their juſt Rights.

Here we have an Hereditary Right to the Crown aſſer- ted both remoter in Himſelf and nearer in the Queen, who was unqueſtionably the next, if there were no Heir Male: It was poſſible this Right might be really defeated by a Prince of *Wales*, and it was poſſible it might be pretended to be ſo when it was not: For there have been many In- ſtances in Hiſtory of ſuborned and ſuppoſititious Princes, and therefore there was reaſon that ſufficient Evidence ſhould be given in a Caſe of ſuch Importance and which was un- der ſo great Suſpicion. But if there was no reaſonable care taken to prevent or remove theſe Suſpicions, then the Par- ties moſt concerned have a Right to aſſert their own Pre- tenſions in ſuch a way as the Law of Nations doth allow.

And in this Caſe no private Depoſitions or confident Affir- mations of ſuch as are Dependents or otherwiſe liable to Suſpicion, can in Reaſon be taken for ſatisfactory Evidence; for let any one conſider what the *Laws* of *Nations* have thought fitting Evidence in a Caſe of this Nature, and he will ſoon find how very much ſhort ſuch proofs are of what the Nature of the Thing hath been thought to require —— The Civil Law is very ſtrict where there is any occaſion of Suſpicion.

"It requires notice to be given twice a Month to "the Parties concerned that they may receive full "ſatisfaction. That the Mother is to be kept in a Houſe by itſelf: "That thirty Days before ſhe expects to be delivered, ſhe muſt "give Notice of it to thoſe who are moſt concerned, that "they may ſend ſuch as they can truſt to be preſent: that there "ought to be but one Door where ſhe is to Lie in, and if "there be more, they muſt be done up; that at that Door "there are to be Three Men and Three Women and Two "Aſſiſtants: That all Perſons are to be ſearcht who go in, "eſpecially at the Labor, at which time there muſt be ſuffici- "ent D. 25. Tit. 4.

"ent Light in the Room. When the Child is born it ought "to be firſt ſhewn to the Parties concerned, and great care "is taken about the Perſons in whoſe Hands he is put, and "Satisfaction muſt be given from time to time that it is the "ſame Child, and if Satisfaction be not given as to theſe "things, the *Roman* Law doth not allow any Right of Poſſeſſion.

By the Old Common Law of *England*, in caſe of Suſpicion, a Writ of Inſpection was allowed, the Form whereof *Bract.* l. 2. c. 32. is in the Books, and if there were any doubt, the Woman was to be put into a ſafe place, where no Suſpicious Perſons were to come near her till ſhe was delivered. This was then thought ſo reaſonable a thing, that *Fleta* l. 1. c. 15. the Old Law Books have a Chapter on purpoſe *De Partu Suppoſito*, wherein Directions are given to prevent and diſcover a Subornation.

Theſe things I mention to ſhow what Satisfaction is neceſſary to be given in caſe of Suſpicion, and the higher the Perſons are, and of ſo much greater Importance as the Succeſſion is, ſo much clearer ought the Evidence to be, that no occaſion of Doubt may remain: But if no ſuch care was taken, If the principal Perſons concerned had not the leaſt Satisfaction given them; If the whole thing were managed with Secrecy and ſuſpicious Circumſtances, then I can ſee no Reaſon to exclude thoſe who are moſt concern'd from a Right of demanding Satisfaction by Force of Arms.

But Mr. *Aſhton* thinks he hath cleared this matter, when he affirms that he *knows* there was no Suppoſititious Birth *by unanſwerable undoubted Proofs* and this is put into his Prayer, that it might look like an appeal to God as to the Truth of what he ſaid. This is one of the boldeſt and moſt artificial Strokes of the Penner of this Speech, not barely to make him affirm it with ſo much aſſurance, but to do it in his Prayer too. But a matter of ſo great Conſequence is not to be determined upon the Teſtimony of any ſingle Witneſs, although he were the moſt competent Witneſs as to ſuch a matter, which doth not in the leaſt appear as to Mr. *Aſhton*: For how

how could he know it by *unanſwerable and undoubted Proofs*; when conſidering the Circumſtances that were in this Caſe, it was hardly poſſible to produce ſuch *Proofs*, as would paſs for unexceptionable Evidence upon a Legal Trial? For there hath been ſuch a Trial here in *England* within the Memory of Man, wherein the Father and Mother and Midwife have all ſworn to the Truth of the Birth of a Son, and yet the Jury upon hearing the whole Evidence have given Judgment that it was Suppoſititious.

In the Caſe of one Robins's *Child, at* Hereford Aſſizes *about An.* 1668.

Therefore bare Affirmations of ſome Perſons concerned are not Evidence ſufficient in Caſe of ſtrong and vehemont Preſumptions to the contrary; and ſuch Evidence ought to have been given as might have either prevented or removed any juſt grounds of Suſpicion.

But ſince no ſuch *unanſwerable undoubted Proofs* were made to thoſe who were moſt concerned, the ſame juſt Right doth remain to the *undoubted* Heir of the Crown, as it did in the former Caſe to the next Heir at Law, who upon a fair Trial and the Verdict of the Country, recovered the Eſtate. But between Princes there are no ſuch ways of Trial or Courts of Judicature, and therefore in ſuch Caſes the Right of War is allowed by the general Conſent of Mankind.

Secondly, There was a further juſt Occaſion for that Expedition, which was the Deſign to ſubvert our Religion and Civil Liberties. As to the Particulars they are fully ſet down in the Declaration, and need not to be repeated; that which I am to make out is, that the then Prince of *Orange* by his Relation to the Crown had a juſt Right to concern himſelf in the Vindication of both, and that this is not repugnant to the Doctrines and Principles of the Church of *England*.

It was not thought diſagreeable to them for Q. *Eliſabeth* to aſſiſt the *Dutch* againſt the King of *Spain*; yet ſhe had no ſuch reaſon for it as our King and Queen had to prevent the ſuppreſſion of their own Religion here, and the Rights of that People to whom they were ſo nearly related. For there was nothing

in

in her Caſe ſo conſiderable as the growing Power of *Spain* and the danger of overturning the Religious and Civil Liberties of a neighbour-People. The Queens Profeſſor of Law in *Oxford* at that time ſaith, that it was then made a Queſtion by ſome whether Q. *Eliſ.* had juſt Reaſon for that War in aſſiſtance of the *Dutch*, and he reſolves the Lawfulneſs of it upon 3 Grounds: First, That it was to prevent enſuing Miſchief; Secondly, From the ancient Alliance between the two Nations; Thirdly, That if the *Dutch* were totally vanquiſhed by the *Spaniard*, they would be made Slaves under an Arbitrary Power. The Queen herſelf owned this as the Ground of her Reſolution, *That it was Chriſtian Piety to relieve them who were of the ſame Religion which ſhe profeſſed, and Wiſdom to prevent the pernicious deſigns of her Enemies.* And in her Declaration ſhe publiſhed this as the Reaſon of her ſending Forces to the Aid of the *Netherlanders*, *That they might peaceably enjoy their ancient Freedom.*

Alberic. Gent. de Jure Bel. l. 1. c. 16.

In the latter end of the Reign of King *James* I. the War broke out in *Germany* wherein the Emperor uſed his utmoſt endeavour to eſtabliſh *abſolute Power and Popery* together. There was occaſion offered to try whether the giving Aſſiſtance againſt theſe were againſt the *Principles* and *Doctrines* of the *Church of England.* For the Prince Elector *Palatine* was choſen King of *Bohemia*, and ſent over for King *James*'s Advice about it: But his Deſigns lay then ſo much another way, that he had no mind he ſhould engage in it: But the Archbiſhop of *Canterbury* in his Letter to Sir R. *Naunton* then Secretary of State, ſaith, *That God had ſet up this Prince his Maſters Son in Law, as a Mark of Honour throughout all Chriſtendom, to propagate the Goſpel and to protect the oppreſſed; that for his own part he dares not but give Advice to follow where God leads, apprehending the Work of God in this and that of* Hungary; *that he was ſatisfied in Conſcience that the* Bohemians *had a juſt Cauſe; that the King's Daughter the Elector's Lady had profeſſed, ſhe would not leave herſelf one Jewel, rather than not maintain ſo Religious and ſo Righteous a Cauſe.*

In

In the beginning of the Reign of King *Charles* the First, when I ſuppoſe it will be granted, That the Doctrins and Principles of the *Church* of *England* were underſtood and followed; the King of *Denmark* had taken up Arms, *to ſettle the Peace and liberty of Germany*, as he declared: But he met with a great Defeat. Whereupon King *Charles* the Firſt thought himſelf concerned to give Aſſiſtance to him: And Archbiſhop *Laud* was then employed (as Dr. *Heylin* confeſſeth) by the King's Command, to draw up a *Declaration*, to be publiſhed in all the Pariſhes of *England*; which was read by the King, and approved by the Council, wherein the *Greatneſs of the Danger they were in is ſet forth, and the People are exhorted to ſerve God and the King, and to labour by their Prayers to divert the Danger.* Wherein lay this Danger? It is there ſaid to be, *That by the Defeat of the King of* Denmark, *there was little or nothing left to hinder the Houſe of* Auſtria *from being Lord and Maſter of* Germany. And what then? Why then *there will be an open way for* Spain *to do what they pleaſed in all the Weſt part of Chriſtendom.* It ſeems then, it was not thought diſagreeable to the Principles and Doctrins of our Church, to hinder the growth of a Weſtern Monarchy, although it be by aſſiſting Subjects againſt their Princes who promote it: And then follow theſe remarkable Words;

Life of Archbiſhop *Laud*, fol. 161.

"You are to know therefore, that to prevent this is the "preſent Care of the King and State; and there is no proba-"ble way left, but by ſending of Forces, and other Supplies, "to the ſaid King of *Denmark*, to enable him to keep the Field, "that our Enemies be not Maſters of all on a ſudden. And not long after—— "If he be not preſently relieved, the Cauſe "of Religion is not only like to ſuffer by it in ſome one part, "(as it hath already in a fearful manner in the *Palatinate*) but "in all places where it hath got any footing. So that if we "ſupply not preſently our Allies and Confederates in this caſe,

"it is like to prove the Extirpation of true Religion, and the "Replanting of *Romiſh Superſtition* in the Neighbouring parts "of Chriſtendom. And the Coldneſs of the State ſhall ſuffer "in all places, as the Betrayers of that Religion elſewhere, "which it profeſſeth and honoureth at home; which will be an "Imputation never to be waſhed off: And God forbid this "State ſhould ſuffer under it.—— And in the laſt place; "You are to call upon God your ſelves, and to incite the "People to joyn with you, in humble and hearty Prayers "unto God, That he will be pleaſed now, after long Affliction "of his dear People and Children, to look in mercy both upon "them and us; and in particular for the Safety of the King "of *Denmark*, and that Army which is left him, That God "would bleſs and proſper him againſt his and our Enemies. Thus far Archbiſhop *Laud*.

Let thoſe who now with as much Ignorance as Confidence, upbraid Men with Renouncing the *Doctrins and Principles of the Church of England*, read and conſider theſe Paſſages; and if any thing will make them more wiſe and humble, this will. Did Archbiſhop *Laud* go off from the Church of *England*, or King *Charles* the Firſt, who both ſuffered for the ſake of it? But ſome Men have never throughly penetrated into the *Doctrins and Principles* of our Church, but look only on ſome Principles in oppoſition to the late Times of Rebellion, and think there is nothing farther to be looked after. Whereas the Conſideration is very different as to our Duties, with reſpect to our own Princes, and thoſe of a more general Concernment as to the ſtate of Religion and Government in the World. But from hence it is plain, that it was then thought not only Lawful, but a Duty, to prevent the dangerous growth of ſuch a Monarchy, which deſigns to ſuppreſs Religion and Civil Liberties; and not only to give Aſſiſtance to thoſe who joyn in the ſame Deſign, but to pray God to bleſs and proſper it. And accordingly a Form of Prayer

was

was then Appointed for thoſe Dangerous Times.

Not long after this a Breach with *France* hapned, and the King Publiſhed a Declaration of the ground of the War; wherein it is laid down as the firſt Ground, "That the Houſe "of *Auſtria* Conſpiring the Ruin of all thoſe of the Reformed "Religion (as plainly appeared in the Affairs of *Germany*) had "ſuch an Influence on the Councils of *France*, as to make "them break Promiſe in ſuch a manner, as hazarded the loſs "of the whole Party in *Germany*. The next is, "That he had "broke his Articles with his *Proteſtant Subjects*, when he "had been a Mediator of Peace between them, and they "had done nothing to violate them. So that a Deſign to ſuppreſs the *Proteſtant Religion*, in a *Neighbour Country*, was looked on as a juſt Cauſe of War, when he was concerned to preſerve it. And then another Form of Prayer was Appointed to be uſed ſuitable to that Occaſion; which plainly evidence, That ſuch a Deſign was no ways thought repugnant to the *Doctrins and Principles of the Church of* England.

But ſince the *French Conduct* ſeems to be now admired by this ſort of Men, I ſhall bring ſome remarkable Inſtances from them.

It is Notorious to the World what Powerful Aſſiſtance the *French* gave to the Confederate Princes of *Germany*, againſt the Emperour, their Lawful Prince, and what Defence they made for this. They Publiſhed an Account to the World of the Reaſons of it, and the Chief was this; *viz.* "That they had Reaſon to ſuſpect, that "from *Charles* the Fifth's Time the difference "of Religions had been ſecretly ſupported "by the Emperours, in order to their making "themſelves Abſolute; and that the Changing the Form of "Government in the Empire, was ſufficient for a Neighbour "Prince to interpoſe by force of Arms.

Motifs de la France *pour la guerre d'* Allemagne, p. 94, 95, 117.

In the Revolt of *Catalonia* from the *King* of *Spain*, their Lawful Prince, the French King accepted of the Sovereignty over them, being offered him by the States of that Country, and cauſed Diſcourſes to be written in Juſtification of their Transferring their Allegeance: And yet their Complaint was nothing but the Severity of the *Spaniſh* Government, and a deſire of ſome greater Liberties than they enjoyed under it. Why then ſhould it be now thought an Unjuſt thing, for a Sovereign Prince (ſo nearly related to the Crown of *England*) to eſpouſe the Cauſe of our Religions and Civil Intereſts, when the Deſign was ſo apparent for the Suppreſſing them? If that Opportunity had been loſt, they might before this time have been paſt all reaſonable hopes of Recovery.

II. But ſuppoſe this were allowed; yet here is another Difficulty ariſeth, concerning the transferring Allegeance from a Lawful Prince, to him that met with unexpected Succeſs in his Deſign.

And here I ſhall endeavour to make it plain, That this is not againſt the *Doctrins and Principles of the Church of England*. If we allow the Church of *England*, to have declared its Senſe in the Matter of Government, it can only be with reſpect to *Subjects*. But I think the Meaſures of our Obedience, are not to be taken from the Rules of the Church; but from the *Laws of the Realm*: Becauſe they are not the ſame in all Countries where the ſame Religion is Profeſſed; as is plain in the Caſe of *France* and *Poland*: The Reaſon of the different *Meaſures* in theſe Countries is not from the Church, but from the different Conſtitution of the Kingdoms.

And I do not ſee how the Rules of the Church can alter the Fundamental Laws: For the Church only enforceth the Duty of Obedience on the Conſciences of Men; but it doth not preſcribe or limit the Bounds of it.

Whether

Whether our Monarchy be *Abſolute*, or *Limited*; or if *Limited*, whether in its *Exerciſe* of *Power*, or in the *Right* of *Sovereignty*; how far the Limitation gives a Right of Reſiſtance, in caſe of the Breach of it; are nice Queſtions, but not to be Reſolv'd by the Rules of the Church; but by our Legal Conſtitution and the General Reaſon of Mankind. And therefore in ſuch Caſes, where the Right of War and a Foreign Power are concerned, we are not to judge meerly by Municipal Laws, but we are to proceed by a more General *Law, viz.* that of *Nations*, which takes in the Effects of a juſt War, which the particular *Laws* of a Country have no regard to.

But where hath the *Church* of *England* declared its ſenſe about the *Right of War?* The *Articles* of our Church declare, *that the chief Government of all Eſtates of this Realm, doth appertain to the Civil Magiſtrate:* But they no where ſay, that in a juſt War the Supream Power cannot be acquired; or that God doth never confer it in an extraordinary method.

The Book of *Homilies* is very ſevere againſt *Diſobedience* and *wilful Rebellion*; but it is no where ſaid, that where the Right of Sovereignty is transferred by a ſucceſsful War, there is no Allegeance due to thoſe who poſſeſs it: On "the contrary it is ſaid in the firſt Part, That If God for their "wickedneſs, had given them an Heathen Tyrant to Reign "over them, they were by God's Word bound to obey him, "and to pray for him. Can it then be agreeable to the *Doctrins* and *Principles of our Church*, to refuſe Allegeance to good Religious Princes, whom God hath made the happy Inſtruments of preſerving our Religion and Liberties?

In the ſame Part, *the Jews are commended for praying for the King of Babylon, when they were in Captivity, that they might live under his Protection, and do him Service, and find Favour in his ſight.* And what is this ſhort of Allegeance to one, who had nothing but bare Succeſs in War, to plead

for

for his Title to it? If any Princes of their own Religion had reſcued them from that Captivity, would they have ſcrupled Allegeance to them, when we ſee how far the *Maccabees* went in the Defence of their Religion and Laws?

In the Second Part, the obedience of the *Jewiſh Nation* to *Auguſtus* is commended; and it is evident that he had no Authority over them, but by the Right of War. And our Bleſſed Saviour's example is mentioned, *who being brought before the Roman Preſident, acknowledged his Power and Authority, to be given him from God.* And how was this Authority conveyed to him, but by the ſucceſs of War?

So that we can find nothing, in the certain eſtabliſhed *Doctrin and Principles of our Church*, which is repugnant to our Allegeance to the preſent Government. I might eaſily produce conſiderable Teſtimonies, of ſome of the greateſt Divines of our Church, which aſſert, that Soverignty may be transferred by a juſt War; but I leave that to others, and proceed.

Mr. Aſhton ſaith, *That we were born leige Subjects to another; that we have ſolemnly profeſſed our Allegeance, and often confirmed it with Oaths.* I know no body denies it. But is this all? Is our Allegeance ſo *inſeparable* from the Perſon we have once ſworn to, that no Caſe whatſoever, can alter it? Not the Caſe of plain voluntary Dereliction? Not the Caſe of putting the Kingdom under a Foreign Power? Not the ſeeking the utter Ruin and Deſtruction of the People? Is Allegeance inſeparable in theſe Caſes, becauſe we were Born Subjects and did ſwear Allegeance? If not, then it is not always ſo, notwithſtanding the Oaths. For theſe and ſeveral others are allowed, by ſuch who have written the moſt warmly againſt the republican Principles. But we need not run to any difficult Caſes: Ours is only the caſe of a juſt War; which is allowed by all ſorts of *Caſuiſts*, who do agree, that Allegeance is due to the Party that prevails in it; and if it be due to one, it cannot be due to another, at the ſame time, altho' he be living

and

and do not diſcharge Perſons from their Oaths; for the obligation of Oaths, depends on the nature and Reaſon of things, and not upon the Pleaſure of thoſe to whom they are made. But where there is a Right to govern, there muſt be a Duty of Allegeance: And that Succeſs in a juſt War, doth give ſuch a Right, I could produce ſo many Teſtimonies, of all kinds of Writers, as would make the Reading of them as tedious, as of thoſe in the Hiſtory of *Paſſive Obedience.* Nay, ſome go ſo far, as to aſſert a Right of Sovereignty to be acquired by ſucceſs, even in an *Unjuſt War*: But we need none of theſe Teſtimonies.

But doth not all this reſolve this whole Controverſy into a Right of Conqueſt, which is not ſo much as pretended in our preſent Caſe?

I Anſwer, That we muſt diſtinguiſh between a *Right to the Government*, and the *Manner of Aſſuming it.* The *Right* was founded on the *Juſt Cauſes* of the War, and the ſucceſs in it: But the aſſuming of it was not by any ways of force or violence, but by a Free *Conſent* of the *People*, who by a *voluntary Recognition*, and their Majeſties acceptance of the Government, as it is ſetled by our Laws, take away any pretence to a Conqueſt over the People, or a Government by Force.

Thus I have endeavoured to ſet this matter in as clear a light, and in as little a compaſs as I could: I now return to Mr. *Aſhton*'s Speech.

Next to his Obligation on the Point of Religion, he mentions that of *Gratitude to the King his Maſter, whom he had ſerved 16 years,* —— *But this, he adds, is a thing not much eſteemed at this time.* As little as it is eſteemed, I know no body would have blamed his *Gratitude*, if it had not carried him beyond the bounds of his *Duty.* But it is ſtrange, he ſhould be ſo much for *Gratitude*, and yet ſhould allow none for ſo

great

great a Deliverance. What is 16 years ſervice to the Preſervation of a Nation, from the imminent danger of *Popery* and *Arbitrary Power?* Such men look but a very little way, who talk at this rate: And can they imagine a *French Power*, under our Circumſtances, could ſecure any thing to us, but Ruin?

As to his *Maſter's uſage*, which he ſaith, *after the Prince of* Orange's *Arrival, was very hard, ſevere; and, if he may ſay it, unjuſt.* I would deſire his Friends to conſider a little better, and to think, if any ſuch thing as Severity had been intended, how eaſy it had been to have Executed it, and to have prevented his going away; and conſequently, a great deal of the charge of the War, he complains of immediately after. Let them name any one Perſon in ſuch Circumſtances, who was allowed ſo great freedom as he had, of diſpoſing of himſelf: But this is very far for Mr. *Aſhton's* occaſion of Suffering.

Well, *But all the new Methods of Setling, have hitherto*, he ſaith, *made the Nation more miſerable, poor, and expoſed to Foreign Enemies.* It is poſſible ſuch may believe, that the Nation would be leſs *miſerable* and *poor* under the *French Power*, than it is now. But no man who obſerves the vaſt deſigns of *France*, and the incredible induſtry of the *French Monarch*, to inlarge his own Power and Dominions, can think (if he thinks twice) that ever he ſhould undertake ſo great a Work, out of kindneſs to any but himſelf; much leſs, out of perfect good will to the *Engliſh Nation.* Hath he given ſo much evidence to the World of his *Sincerity* in his Promiſes, when the keeping of them hath been prejudicial to his Intereſt? Suppoſe he ſhould compaſs his end upon us, and under ſo fair a Colour, make Provinces of theſe Kingdoms; what poſſible remedy would there be for this, then indeed, *poor and miſerable Nation?* What comfort will it then be to ſay, *they did not think he would have broken his word ſo with them?* In the mean time, Is it not great *Wiſdom* and *Policy*,

Policy, to venture our Religion, and all our Liberties on the ſincerity and kindneſs of *France*? But if there be any preſent hardſhip, it is no more than a neceſſary War involves our Neighbours in as well as our ſelves; and that in a common Cauſe, for preſerving the Liberty of *Europe*, againſt the growing Power of *France*, as it did formerly of *Spain*.

But there is another Inſinuation of a higher nature, viz. *that the Religion we pretend to be ſo fond of preſerving, is now much more than ever, likely to be deſtroyed.* What is the meaning of this? What! More in danger than when Penal Laws and Teſts were taking away, in order to the taking away our Religion after them? When the deſign was as plain, and open as a thing of that nature could be, in ſuch a Nation? When ſome of the Factors themſelves complained, they made too much haſte, and were too eager and forward, to accompliſh it. And altho' nothing was then pretended, but the ſetling *Liberty of Conſcience* upon a new *Magna Charta*, yet all wiſe Men ſaw through theſe pretences, and that nothing was really deſigned but Popery; which the Jeſuits did not conceal in their Letters to each other: One of the which hapned to be intercepted; and the thing it ſelf, is now fully owned in the Kings own Letter to the Pope, printed at the end of the late Trials. So that there muſt be a deſign, either to deceive the Pope, or the Nation; and which is the more probable, let any man of ſenſe judge.

But where lies the danger of our Religion now? Have we not the ſame Laws, the ſame Protection, the ſame Encouragement, which we ever had, at any time ſince the Reformation? If our Religion be now in danger, it is by ſuch men who would bring in the *French Power* to eſtabliſh it; however it be diſguiſed under another Pretext.

After this follows a Charge of no leſs than *Perjury* and *Rebellion*, upon his Fellow Subjects; *whom*, he adviſeth *to return to their Allegeance, before the Judgments of God overtake them, for their Per-*

jury and Rebellion. This is a heavy Charge indeed, upon the Body of the Nation, which hath taken the Oaths of Allegeance to their Majeſties: But if it be true, it is accuſing the greateſt part of mankind of theſe Sins, who have hapned to live in the time of any great Revolutions, or changes of Government. Was the Nation *Forſworn*, in the times of *William* the Conqueror, and his two Sons, and his Nephew? Was it *Forſworn* all the time of King *John*, and the ſeveral Reigns of the 4th, 5th, 6th and 7th *Henries*? One would think it better became a dying man to judge more charitably of his Fellow Subjects. Had he never heard of the Law of *England*, requiring Allegeance to the King, on account of the Poſſeſſion of the Crown; and that our moſt eminent Lawyers, in peaceable and quiet Times, have been of that Opinion? Methinks at leaſt, that ſhould make modeſt men, not ſo peremptory in ſuch a Charge; for it is to make, ſuch an Oath unlawful, which the Law makes not only lawful, but a Duty. And when the greateſt Lawyers this Nation hath had thought this a part of our Law; ſhall ſuch who confeſs themſelves *unskilful in the Law*, charge the Nation with Perjury, for taking an Oath, which the Law requires?

But if our Law did not require it, there is ſuch a general conſent in mankind about it, that it ſeems to me, to be a *Law of Nations*, That an Oath of Fidelity ſhould follow Poſſeſſion; becauſe otherwiſe, there would be infinite ſnares to the Conſciences of all ſuch who are required to obey, but are not bound to enquire into the *Rights* of *War*.

Is it Perjury and Rebellion in the new *French* Conqueſts, for the Inhabitants to take Oaths of Fidelity to the *French* King? If not, how comes it to be ſo here? Is there not the ſame *Right* of *War* here as abroad?

Was it *Perjury* and *Rebellion* in the Subjects of the King of *Spain* in *Portugal*, to take a new *Oath* of *Allegeance* to the Duke of *Braganza*, when he was declared *King*? And yet they were all ſworn before, not only to the *King* of *Spain*, but

but *to his Heirs:* And even the Duke himſelf, had not only taken this Oath; but the *Spaniard* particularly charged him with *Perjury*, and great *Ingratitude*: Yet the obligation to his Countries good, was then thought to overrule that Perſonal Obligation to the King of *Spain*.

But if they were all guilty of *Perjury* and *Rebellion*; how came the other Princes of *Europe* ſo frankly and readily to own his Government; and the *French*, as much and as early as any, ſending Aſſiſtance by Sea and Land to ſupport it? But in this Revolution of *Portugal*, the beſt Title was the Succeſs of War, founded on a remote Title to the Crown, when the King of *Spain* had enjoyed the Poſſeſſion of that Crown to the Third Generation.

But it may be ſaid, *That the Practices of other People are to be no Rule to us; and that we are not to be guided by bad Precedents abroad, but by the Principles and Doctrins of our own Church.* This were to the purpoſe, if our Church had any where declared, Taking ſuch an Oath to be *Perjury*. But where is that done? I confeſs, I can find no ſuch thing: And if Mr *Aſhton* (or his Friends) had made ſuch a Diſcovery, they ought to have told the World of it. But if there be no ſuch *Declaration* to be met with, then we are left to the General Rules of Conſcience, and the Common Reaſon of Mankind; according to which, I ſee no ground for this heavy Charge of *Perjury* and *Rebellion* in our preſent Caſe.

But although Mr. *Aſhton* be ſo abundantly ſatisfied in the Deſign he mentions, *that if he had ten thouſand Lives, he would ſacrifice them all in ſo good and neceſſary a Work*; yet the Remainder of his Speech is ſpent in clearing his Innocency as to the Fact for which he was Condemned. If it was ſo Meritorious an Act to Die in ſuch a Cauſe, a Man might have been tempted to be thought Guilty.

But before he could think fit to Die in Charity with all the World, he ſaith ſeveral things with a Deſign to blacken the *Judges*, the *Jury*, and the *Government*.

The *Judges* he Accuſes of a *Severe Charge*, and *the Hard Meaſure he received* ——.

As to the latter, it is a very odd kind of *Hard Meaſure*, when he was ſo very little ſenſible of it then, that he ſaid, *He did not Complain of the Court*, fo. 112. and more fully afterwards, fo. 115. *I cannot but own I have had a fair Trial for my Life.* Where was the Hard Meaſure then? Therefore this could not be Mr. *Aſhton*'s Senſe, unleſs he would contradict himſelf; and thoſe who would free him from it, muſt take theſe Words to have been written by others, who thought to ſerve another End by it; and were not ſo near giving an Account for ſuch Calumnies.

The ſeverity of the Charge lay in applying the Statute 25 *Edw.* 3. to his Fact. Which was a *Deſign to carry into France a Treaſonable Scheme and Project of an Invaſion, in order to the depoſing the King and Queen.* This laſt the Judges declared, *had been always held to be High-Treaſon.* All the Queſtion was then, Whether ſuch a Fact were an *Overt-Act* of ſuch a Deſign; and ſo it was left to the Jury, whether Mr. *Aſhton* intended to go over with ſuch a Deſign or not. If there be any Severity here, it muſt be in the Law; and that all thoſe who ſuffer by a Law, are apt to complain of.

He particularly chargeth *that Judge*, and *that Jury-man, who did*, he ſaith, *ſignally contrary to common Juſtice, expoſe themſelves to deſtroy him.* This is a very hard Charge from a Dying man, and ought to have great Evidence to reconcile it to *common Charity*; but he offers none. The *Jury* were to Act according to their Conſciences; and if they did ſo, how could they *expoſe themſelves contrary to common Juſtice to deſtroy him?* But what Evidence doth he give, that they did not ſo? Some have told him, *that he was the firſt man that was ever Condemned for High Treaſon, upon bare ſuſpicion or Preſumption,*

on, and that contrary to my Lord Cook *and other Eminent Lawyers Opinions.*

The main point as to the *Jury*, was, Whether they were ſatisfied in their Conſciences, that Mr. *Aſhton* intended to go into *France* with ſuch a Deſign? And where the Fact lies in the *Intention*, there can be no direct Evidence (without ſeeing the Heart;) but it muſt be gathered from a Concurrence of Circumſtances, ſtrong enough to determine an honeſt mans Judgment: And ſuch the *Jury* believed to be in his Caſe. *My Lord Cooks* words are on the Caſe of Treaſon *That the Compaſſing, Intent: or Imagination, tho ſecret, is to be tried by the Peers, and to be diſcovered by Circumſtances precedent, concomitant and ſubſequent, with all endeavour evermore for the ſafety of the King.*

It is true, he ſaith afterwards, *Fol.* 12. *That conjectural Preſumptions, or Inferences, or ſtrains of Wit, are not ſufficient*, but there muſt be *good and manifeſt Proof*; but ſtill this Proof muſt be ſuch as the thing will bear; for there can be no *direct and plain proof* of a ſecret Intention: Either therefore no man can be juſtly Condemned for a ſecret Intention, manifeſted by an *Overt-Act*, or there muſt be ſuch a Proof allowed, as is ſufficient to ſatisfie a mans Conſcience, although it come not up to plain and direct Evidence, as it is oppoſed to the higheſt degree of Preſumption.

But it may be ſaid, *that the Preſumption lies in judging the Intention from the* Overt Act, *but that* Overt-Act *muſt be manifeſtly proved.* The *Overt-Act* in this caſe was the *carrying over Treaſonable Papers into* France, *in order to an Invaſion.* The ſole Queſtion then was, Whether there was *manifeſt proof* as to theſe Papers. That the Papers were found about him was manifeſtly proved; and he owns *Fol.* 110. *that they were unfortunately found upon him*; but he ſaith *that he knew not the Importance of them.* It was manifeſtly proved, that he had an extraordinary Concernment to have theſe Papers thrown

thrown Over-board; which he ſaith *was perfectly out of Friendſhip*, and whether that was a true Anſwer, was left to the Conſciences of the *Jury*, who were to judge of this by all the *Circumſtances antecedent, concomitant and ſubſequent*, by which they did conclude him Guilty. And I cannot ſee how they went againſt *Common Juſtice* therein; eſpecially ſince Mr. *Aſhton* well knew, that one of the moſt material Papers taken, was of his own *Hand writing*; not the firſt Draught, but the Copy which was ſhewed him in the Court; and when it was ſo, he deſired, *Fol.* 106. *that the Original may be read, and not the Copy*; and he had good reaſon for it: For as far as I can judge, upon peruſal of both, it is the very ſame Hand in which this Speech was written. But what ſaid Mr. *Aſhton* to the *Jury*, to clear this matter? He ſaith, *Fol.* 129. *That his hand was not proved to any of the Papers, and therefore there was nothing but ſuppoſition or ſuſpicion againſt him.* It is true, there was no direct and plain proof of the Hand, as there was in the caſe of my *Lord Preſton*; (and it is a wonder it was omitted, for that would have been plain proof of his *knowing what was in thoſe Papers*:) However, all the other Circumſtances put together, were a ſufficient proof of his Privity to the Contents of them.

And I wonder how Mr. *Aſhton*, could ſo confidently in his Paper *declare himſelf Innocent, as to the matter for which he was Sentenced to Die*, when he knew the Paper was of his own Hand writing, and plain proof hath been ſince made of his own delivery of it to a third Perſon. Can a man be Innocent and Guilty of the ſame thing?

The only thing to be taken notice of, which remains, is, a Reflection on the Government for his *Cloſe Impriſonment, and the haſty and violent Proceedings againſt him.* If there were any thing more than uſual in ſuch caſes, as to his *Impriſonment*, he ought to have mentioned the particulars; for otherwiſe it is to Arraign the *Common Juſtice* of

of the Nation. As to the *haſty and violent Proceedings* of his Trial; it was then told him, That the greateſt Advantage he had, was in putting off his Trial: For by that he knew how *to lay the Papers on my Lord* Preſton; which yet could not clear him, as to thoſe Papers which were not written with my Lord's Hand, nor related any ways to him; but one of them was Written with his own Hand.

Upon the whole Matter, I cannot ſee how he hath either *Proved his Innocency*, or that he acted according to the *Principles and Doctrins of the Church of* England.

As to his Concluding Prayer, I cannot but obſerve, That in the Beginning of the Speech, the Reaſon he gives why he *would not make any to the People*, was, *becauſe he would employ his laſt Minutes in Devotion and holy Communion with God:* Which I hope he did. But thoſe who contrived the Speech, were to make a Prayer for him too; but not a *Prayer* of *Devotion*, but rather of *Faction* and *Sedition:* For it hath no other meaning, than that God would overturn this Preſent Government, and reſtore the Former, in order to the *Flouriſhing of the Church of* England; *notwithſtanding the Wounds ſhe hath received from her Prevaricating Sons.*

I cannot imagine how a Man could joyn theſe things together in a Prayer, unleſs he could think all thoſe are *Prevaricating Sons*, who are againſt Popery. For I know no Bottom large enough for *Popery*, and the *Church of England*, to ſtand upon together.

But this I do not think of Mr. *Aſhton*, and therefore Conclude, as I began, That this ſeems rather the Speech of a Party, than of Mr. *Aſhton*; who made uſe of his Name and Hand, to convey into the Minds of the People, the moſt malicious Inſinuations againſt this Preſent Government, and all who live in Obedience to it.

A Catalogue of some Books, *lately Printed for* R. Clavell.

FORMS of Private Devotion for every Day in the Week, in a Method agreeable to the Liturgy; with Occasional Prayers, and an Office for the Holy Communion, and for the Time of Sickness. Humbly recommended to all the Pious and Devout Members of the Church of *England*.

A Sermon Preached before the Queen at *White-Hall*, *February* the Fifteenth, 169⅞. By *Henry Dove*, D.D. Chaplain to Their Majesties.

Roman Forgeries in the Councils, during the first Four Centuries, together with an Appendix, concerning the Forgeries and Errors in the Annals of *Baronius*. By *Thomas Comber*, D. D. Precentor of *York*.

A Scholastical History of the primitive and general Use of Liturgies in the Christian Church; together with an Answer to Mr. *David Clarkson*'s late Discourse concerning Liturgies; in Two Parts, in *Octavo*. By the same Hand.

Seasonable Reflections on a late Pamphlet, Entituled, *A History of Passive Obedience since the Reformation*; wherein the true Notion of Passive Obedience is setled and secured from the Malicious Interpretations of ill-designing Men.

The Golden Rule, or the Royal Law of Equity explained: By *J. Goodman*, D. D.

The Frauds of the Romish Priests and Monks set forth in Eight LETTERS; lately written by a Gentleman in his Journy into *Italy*.

A late Letter concerning the Proceedings in *Scotland*, and Sufferings of the Episcopal Clergy there; in *Quarto*, price 6*d*.

Political Arithmetick, or a Discourse concerning the Extent and Value of Lands, People, Buildings; Husbandry, Manufacture, Commerce, Fishery, Artizans, Seamen, Soldiers; Publick Revenues, Interest, Taxes, Superlucration, Registries, Banks; Valuation of Men, Increasing of Seamen, of Militia's, Harbors, Situation, Shipping, Power at Sea, &c. As the same relates to every Country in general; but more particularly to the Territories of His Majesty of *Great Britain*, and his Neighbors of *Holland*, *Zealand*, and *France*. By Sir *William Petty*, late Fellow of the *Royal Society*.

Their present Majesties Government proved to be throughly setled, and that we may submit to it, without asserting the Principles of Mr. *Hobbs*; shewing also, That Allegiance was not due to the Usurpers, after the late Civil War; occasion'd by some late Pamphlets against the Reverend Dr. *Sherlock*.

FINIS.